

Specific Comments to Authors: my main criticism which is the reference list and the referencing style. From page 25 on, there are about 15 references cited for the 10 last pages of the manuscript, while the information presented is based on tens if not hundreds of systematic reviews.

Why are those reviews not cited? What was the criteria for selecting the titles still presented in the reference list? The first? The last? The larges? The best? As it is now the list covers 4% all the studies analyzed.

We reviewed 1219 articles; because the number is big, we cited only articles that report distinct results or outcomes. We increased the citation from 49 articles to 137 articles. If you need to cite more articles, we can do that.

Closer to my field of expertise, I have to note that the literature covering "COVID-19 and transplantation" is very incomplete: The paper of Marinaki et al (reference 39) is a verbatim of the first systematic review in the field (Oltean et al, Infect Dis Nov 2020) with more updated numbers but identical results.

We included (Oltean et al, Infect Dis Nov 2020).

The paper of Moris et al (Transplant Inf Dis, Dec 2020) is also left out although it is very well written and was also a large source of inspiration for Marinaki.

This article published in Dec 2020, and we included the only article until October 30, 2020.

Likewise, the paper of Avery (Transplantation, Jan 2021) or Zaidan (Transplantation, Jan 2021) should be included as all of these have been freely available online since the autumn.

This article published in Jan 2021, and we included only the article until October 30, 2020.

Many individuals who put strenuous efforts to provide quality data to the scientific community while being overwhelmed by the pandemic at work will feel frustrated by not having their work acknowledged. I think the authors should consider a more sensible approach to this.

I agree with you.